

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-21, and 26-30 are pending in this application. Claims 7-14 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 27-29 have been cancelled by this reply. Claims 1, 15, and 26 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15, and 26.

**Claim Amendments**

Independent claims 1, 15, and 26 have been amended to clarify that (i) the content of a thumbnail in a presentation may be changed in a manner that is transparent to the user and (ii) the presentation may be updated to include the modified thumbnail in a manner that is transparent to a user viewing the presentation on a remote display device. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0038] – [0040] of the instant specification. Further, claims 1, 15, and 26 have been amended to include the subject matter (*i.e.*, the presentation is updated to include the modified thumbnail) of cancelled claims 27-29, respectively. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-5, 15-16, 18-21, 26, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,693,661 (“Vanderwilt”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,141

(“Pavley”). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness “...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” (See MPEP §2143.03). Further, “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” (See MPEP §2143.03). The Applicant respectfully asserts that the references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of amended independent claims 1, 15, and 26.

Specifically, the Examiner has admitted that neither Vanderwilt nor Pavley teach or suggest transparently updating the presentation on a remote display. (See Office Action mailed April 19, 2005, p. 7). Thus, Vanderwilt and Pavley do not teach or suggest the limitations recited in the amended independent claims. Further, the Applicant respectfully asserts that U.S. Patent No. 6,397,251 (“Graf”), which was used to reject cancelled claims 27-29 (See Office Action mailed April 19, 2005), does not teach that which Vanderwilt and Pavley lack.

Specifically, the independent claims, as amended, clarify the following (i) the *content* of a selected thumbnail is modified to obtain a modified thumbnail in a manner *transparent to the user* viewing the presentation and (ii) the presentation is transparently updated to include the modified thumbnail.

In contrast, Graf is directed to system for transparently changing the time delay for the presentation of a multimedia file in order to account for delayed arrival of frames at the receiver due to the spreading of transmission of these frames over time. (See Graf, col. 4, ll. 15-19). In view of the above, Graf teaches transparently modifying the delivery parameters (e.g., time delay, etc.). However, Graf does not teach or suggest any mechanism to allow *content* of a given thumbnail to be changed in the presentation while the presentation is being presented in a

manner that is transparent to a user viewing the presentation at a remote display device. At most, Graf can be relied upon to teach a mechanism for providing reliable quality of transmission, which the Applicant respectfully asserts is not sufficient to teach *transparent* modification of thumbnail content and transparent updating of a presentation to include the modified thumbnail in a manner transparent to the user viewing the presentation.

In view of the above, none of the aforementioned referenced, whether considered separately or in combination, teach or suggest the invention recited in the amended independent claims. Accordingly, the amended independent claims are patentable over the aforementioned references. Dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


Claims 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Vanderwilt and Pavley in view of Graf. Claims 27-29 have been cancelled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is moot. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159/033001; P6181).

Dated: July 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord

Registration No.: 46,479

OSHA · LIANG LLP

1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800

Houston, Texas 77010

(713) 228-8600

(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant